

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 have been examined in the present application. Claims 1 and 17-21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C § 112, second paragraph. Claims 1 and 17-21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Claims 1-3, 11, 12 and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Mayaud (U.S. Pat. No. 5,845,255). Claims 4-6, 13, 19 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Mayaud in view of Nelson et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,564,104). Claims 7, 8, 17, 18 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Mayaud in view of Anderl et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,882,474). Claims 9, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Mayaud in view of Engleson (U.S. Pat. No. 5,781,442). Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Mayaud in view of Engleson and further in view of Nelson. Claims 19-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Engleson. Claims 1 and 19-21 have been canceled hereby. Claims 2 and 17-20 have been amended hereby. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and below remarks.

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C § 112, second paragraph, and under 35 U.S.C. § 101. These rejections have been rendered moot due to Applicant's cancellation of claim 1.

Claims 17-21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C § 112, second paragraph, and under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Applicant has amended claims 17-21 to overcome these rejections. The amendments to claims 17-21 were made to comply with MPEP 2106 (IV)(B)(1)(a), and to better describe Applicant's invention. The amendments to claim 17-21 are fully supported by the specification, and do not raise the necessity for a new search. (See page

3, lines 14-25) Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 17-21 under 35 U.S.C § 112, second paragraph, and under 35 U.S.C. § 101 is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 11, 12 and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Mayaud. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Mayaud has been rendered moot due to Applicant's cancellation of claim 1.

Claim 2 explicitly requires that "a hospital acquires individual medical treatment information from the database using **the user ID, the second password, the hospital ID, and the hospital password as keys**, and stores updated individual medical treatment information in the database using the user ID, the second password, the hospital ID, and the hospital password as keys." (Emphasis added) Applicant respectfully submits that this feature of the present invention is neither taught nor suggested by Mayaud.

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects the above-mentioned limitation in claim 2 by citing Mayaud at col. 10, lines 41, 44; col. 17, lines 40-54; and col. 49, line 41. The cited portions of Mayaud merely discloses that the "access to the host computer facility be device-independent so that a given user can access the system via any of numerous devices, provided they have the right password or passwords."

While Mayaud generally discloses the use of "passwords," Mayaud does not teach or suggest using "the user ID, the second password, the hospital ID, and the hospital password as keys" for a hospital to acquire individual medical treatment information from the database, as distinctly recited in claim 2. The claimed method is novel and non-

obvious over the prior art at least because of the unique way various IDs and passwords are used to retrieve information from the database. For at least this reason, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 2 over Mayaud is respectfully requested.

Claims 3-16 are dependent on and include all of the limitations of claim 2. Therefore, all of the above arguments regarding claim 2 are equally as applicable to claims 3-16. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3-16 over Mayaud is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 4-6, 13, 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Mayaud in view of Nelson. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Nelson was added to Mayaud to read on the limitation of "a charge is levied on the hospital when the hospital acquires individual medical treatment information from the database." However, the addition of Nelson does not cure the above-mentioned deficiencies of Mayaud discussed in relation to claim 2. For at least that reason, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 4-6 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Mayaud in view of Nelson is respectfully requested.

The rejection of claims 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Mayaud in view of Nelson has been rendered moot due to Applicant's cancellation of these claims.

Claims 7, 8, 17, 18 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Mayaud in view of Anderl. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Anderl was added to Mayaud to read over the limitation of claim 7 reciting that "a user password is altered using the user ID and the user password as keys." Claims 7

and 8 dependent on and includes all of the limitations of independent claim 2. The addition of Anderl does not cure the above-mentioned deficiencies of Mayaud discussed in relation to claim 2. For at least that reason, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Mayaud in view of Anderl is respectfully requested.

Claim 17 explicitly recites “a computer program for sending a user password and a second password to a user terminal.” Applicant respectfully submits that this feature of the present invention is neither taught nor suggested by Mayaud, Anderl, or the combination thereof.

In paragraph 21 of the Office Action, in rejecting claim 17, the Examiner cites Anderl at col. 4, lin. 64-68; col. 5, lin. 1-5; and col. 6, lin. 19-21. In the cited portions, Anderl merely teaches the user identifying himself by means of a password before accessing files other than those accessible by the public. While Anderl discloses using multiple passwords for various levels of security (see Anderl col. 5 lin. 30-63), Anderl does not disclose “sending a user password and **a second password to a user terminal**,” as recited in claim 17. (Emphasis added). There is no teaching or suggestion in Anderl that two of its passwords are sent to the user as required by claim 17. For at least this reason, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Mayaud in view of Anderl is respectfully requested.

Claim 18 depends on and includes all of the limitation of independent claim 17. Therefore all of the above-mentioned arguments with respect to claim 17 are equally as applicable to claim 18. For at least this reason, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Mayaud in view of Anderl is respectfully requested.

The rejection of claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Mayaud in view of Anderl has been rendered moot due to Applicant's cancellation of claim 21.

Claims 9, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Mayaud in view of Engleson. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Engleson was added to Mayaud to read on the limitations contained in dependent claims 9, 14 and 15. However, the addition of Engleson does not cure the above-mentioned deficiencies of Mayaud discussed in relation to claim 2, on which claims 9, 14 and 15 depend. For at least that reason, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9, 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Mayaud in view of Engleson is respectfully requested.

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Mayaud in view of Engleson and further in view of Nelson. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Engleson and Nelson were added to Mayaud to read on the limitations contained in dependent claim 10. However, the addition of Engleson and Nelson does not cure the above-mentioned deficiencies of Mayaud discussed in relation to claim 2, on which claim 10 depends. For at least that reason, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 10, over Mayaud in view of Engleson and Nelson is respectfully requested.

Claims 19-20 were rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Engleson. These rejections have been rendered moot due to Applicant's cancellation of claims 19-20.

Application No. 09/833,148
Amendment dated April 17, 2006
Reply to Office Action of January 18, 2006

Docket No.: X2850.0048

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Dated: April 17, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Ian R. Blum

Registration No.: 42,336

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &
OSHINSKY LLP

1177 Avenue of the Americas

41st Floor

New York, New York 10036-2714

(212) 835-1400

Attorney for Applicant